

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112
Art Unit: 1714
Page 7

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 03 2006

REMARKS

Claims 3 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claims 1-2 and 27-28, have been cancelled in view of this amendment and without prejudice to filing the subject matter of these claims in one or more continuation applications. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-19, 22-25, 29, 33, and 49 are pending.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-17, 22-26, and 30 as being unpatentable over Betto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,606) in view of WO 96/18695. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 22-25, 27-28, and 30 as being unpatentable over Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083) in view of WO 96/18695 as well as over Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083) in view of WO 96/18695 and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,623).

In paragraphs 3-5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner incorporates by reference the previous rejections from the Office Action mailed March 29, 2006, and, in paragraph 7, the Examiner states that Applicant's previous arguments filed September 28, 2005 have been fully considered and, with the exception of the arguments concerning the previous rejection of claims over Takahashi et al., are not deemed to be persuasive. The Examiner discusses the various reasons on the following pages of the Final Office Action.

While Applicant respectfully disagrees and continues to believe that the present claims are patentable over the combinations of references cited by the Examiner, in order to advance prosecution of this application, claims 3 and 29 have been rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of base claims 1 and 27. As discussed in more detail below, since the Examiner states that claims 3 and 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, Applicant therefore believes these claims are in condition for allowance and are patentable over

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112

Art Unit: 1714

Page 8

the combinations of references cited by the Examiner. Furthermore, since claims 5-9, 11-13, 15-19, and 22-25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 3, reciting further embodiments of the present invention, these claims should also be patentable over these references. Finally, claims 1 and 27, as well as claims 2 and 28, have been cancelled by this amendment, and claims 10 and 26 were cancelled in the previous response filed September 28, 2005, making the rejection of these claims moot. Applicant has cancelled these claims without prejudice to filing the subject matter in one or more continuation applications.

Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 1-2, 5-13, 15-17, 22-26, and 30 are patentable over Betto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,606) in view of WO 96/18695 and that claim 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 22-25, 27-28, and 30 are patentable over Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083) in view of WO 96/18695 as well as over Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083) in view of WO 96/18695 and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 5,997,623), and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 8 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 29 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but further states that these would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In particular, the Examiner states that these claims would be allowable given that the "closest" prior art, namely Betto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,606) and Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083), is drawn to aqueous ink which is in direct contrast to present claims 3 and 29, which require non-aqueous inks.

In addition, in paragraph 9 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 33 and 49 are allowable over the "closest" prior art, namely Betto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,606) and Zhu (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,083), for the same reason.

Applicant is grateful for the allowable subject matter of claims 3, 29, 33, and 49. In response, Applicant has rewritten claims 3 and 29 in independent form, including the features

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112
Art Unit: 1714
Page 9

of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 3 and 29 are in condition for allowance, along with allowable claims 33 and 49.

Furthermore, as discussed in more detail above, since the remaining pending claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable claims, Applicant therefore believes that these claims should also be found allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes that this application is in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would further expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Robert M. Amici
Reg. No. 52,554
Cabot Corporation
Law Department
157 Concord Road
Billerica, MA 01821-7001

Date: October 3, 2006
Attorney Docket No.: 00069CON